The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES): Now, the House is adjourned for lunch till 3.00 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at twelve minutes past two of the clock.

3.00 P.M.

The House reassembled at six minutes past two of the clock, the Vice-Chairman (Shri John F. Fernandes) in the Chair.

THE NOTARIES AMENDMENT (BILL), 1997

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND THE MINISTER OF STATE AND THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF POWER (SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH): Sir, on behalf of Shri Ramakant D. Khalap, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Notaries Act, 1952.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

THE COAST-GUARD (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1996

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF DEFENCE (SHRI N.V.N. SOMU): Sir, I beg to move:

> "That the Bill further to amend the Coast Guard Act, 1978, be taken into consideration."

Sir, the Coast-Guard Act, 1978, came into force on 19th August 1978. This Act is an amalgam of certain provisions of the Border Security Force Act, 1968, the Army Act, 1950 and the Navy Act, 1957. The Coast Guard has been constituted for ensuring the security of the maritime zones of the country. This service keeps the nation's vast Exclusive Economic Zone of 2.2 million square kilometres and a coastline of 7,600 kilometres under regular surveillance against activities inimical and adverse to our national interests.

Based on certain deficiencies and anomalies noticed during the last 18 years in the working of the Coast Guard Act, the amendments propose to make certain changes therein, to bring some of its provisions in conformity with the provisions of the Army Act, 1950, the Navy Act, 1957 and the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. Therefore, in conformity with the provisions of these Acts, the amendments are brought in here. I request this august House to consider these and pass the Bill.

Sir, I commend the Bill for the consideration of the House.

The question was proposed.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES): There are three amendments—one each by Shri J. Chitharanjan, Shri Gurudas Das Gupta and Shri Ramachandran Pillai—for reference of the Bill to a Select Committee of the Rajya Sabha. The hon. Members may move their amendments.

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PILLAI (Kerala): Sir, I want to move that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee of the Rajya Sabha.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES): Any other Member? None? Okay.

SHRI N.V.N. SOMU: Sir, already the Bill has been duly considered by a Standing Committee. The Bill was introduced in the Rajya Sabha on 26th November 1996. It was thereafter referred by the hon. Speaker, Lok Sabha, in consultation with the hon. Chairman, Rajya Sabha, to the Standing Committee on Defence.

Briefing and presentation by the representatives of the Ministry of Defence was given before the Committee on 12th December 1996. A detailed reply to queries raised by the Committee was thereafter submitted. The Committee, consequently, on 11th March 1997 undertook clause-by-clause consideration of the Coast-Guard (Amendment) Bill, 1996. After the above-mentioned detailed scrutiny of the Bill, in the light of the background note and written and verbal clarifications during the meeting, the Committee submitted its report, which was laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on 22nd April 1997.

As per this Report, after a detailed examination, the Committee has adopted this Bill and it has not made any recommendation for amendment. The Bill has undergone a detailed scrutiny by the Standing Committee on Defence. The amendments proposed in this Bill relate to service matters of the Coast Guard, to bring some service rules in line with the provisions in other armed forces Acts like the Army Act, the Navy Act etc. Under these circumstances referring the Bill to the...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES): Mr. Minister, are you replying to the amendment? I think there is going to be a debate.

SHRI N.V.N. SOMU: I say that the amendment is not necessary.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES): You can reply to it when the debate is over.

Let members speak now. Subsequently you can reply to it.

SHRI N.V.N. SOMU: At the initial stage itself I am saying that the amendment is not necessary. It need not be sent to a Select Committee because the Standing Committee has already discussed it threadbare and recommended it unanimously. That is why I am presenting it to the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES): Anyway, the hon. member has moved the amendment.

Now, the motion for consideration of the Coast-Guard (Amendment) Bill, 1996 and the motion for reference of the Bill to a Select Committee are open for discussion.

I will call the name of Shri Rajagopal.

SHRI O. RAJAGOPAL (Madhya Pradesh): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

Having gone through this Bill, I don't think that it involves questions of policy in a big way. As the hon. Minister mentioned, it relates mostly to bringing its provisions in line with the provisions in the Navy Act and other Acts. Mostly they are questions of procedure, limitation, definition etc. etc. As I see it, it is not a controversial Bill on the question of principle as such. As the Minister pointed out, as per the Third Report of the Standing Committee on the Ministry of Defence which was submitted here on the 11th of April, 1997, the Standing Committee has unanimously accepted the entire Bill and it has not recommended any amendment. That is also true.

But, I would like to point out one or two aspects within the short time available to me. The Coast Guard takes care of 2.2 million sq. metres of the Exclusive Economic Zone and about 7,600 km. of the coastline. Till now, we were mostly concerned about the threat from Pakistan on the western side and from China on the eastern side. But, now, recently, a new dimension has been added, in the sense that some problems have now arisen in the southern region also. Therefore, I want to know coastline. hon. Minister the steps taken on the recommendations of the Coast Guard a year back, in which they had specifically suggested creation of two more bases, one in Goa and another in Cochin, in order to strengthen the force. They had also men-

tioned about the need for new ships, better quality aircraft, twin-engine helicopters and stronger patrol boats. I find that the ship-building yards in Goa and Calcutta have not delivered the ships demanded by the Coast Guard in time. That has created a problem.

With reference to the southern coast, I would like to say something. Ever since the Governments of Jammu and Kashmir, Gujarat and Maharashtra started taking strong steps to contain smuggling, smugglers from Pakistan have taken to smuggling through the southern coast at Tuticorin and the western coast in Kerala where a congenial atmosphere is available to them. These smuggling activities have increased in those areas. In these respects the need for strengthening the Coast Guard in this region has increased.

We have also been reading in newspapers that the fishermen from Tamil Nadu are being captured by the Sri lankan Navy, because they do not know the exact border in the sea. They say that our fishermen have trespassed the border, while our fishermen say they have not. Every week such cases are occurring. I believe the Coast Guard has an important role in this. They can give sufficient warning to the fishermen about the approaching border. Therefore, they have an additional responsibility over and above what has already been set apart for them.

There is also a need for the Coast Guard to act in cooperation and in proper understanding with the State Governments. It is unfortunate that there is a lack of coordination with the Tamil Nadu and Kerala Governments. There have been cases, particularly during the monsoon and the summer season when fishermen from Kerala are lost in the sea and it takes a lot of time to trace them out. So, a proper coordination and timely help to the fishermen will go a long way in sorting out this problem.

There is also a problem of big foreign vessels controlled by multi-national companies poaching into our area and carrying on fishing, thus adversely affecting the interests of the Indian fishermen. There should be a special effort to see that such poaching activities are effectively stopped.

It has been pointed out that the R.D.X. used in the Bombay serial blasts was brought in through Ratnagiri and not through Bombay. That means it was brought in through the southernmost coast. Therefore, extra vigilance is called for to see that our national interests are properly safeguarded. For this purpose, the Coast Guard in November 1996 had demanded that the existing aging fleet be replaced. There was considerable delay in that. They want new ships, aircraft, hover-craft, twin-engined helicopters and patrol boats. For this purpose there was a demand for allocation of Rs. 2500 crores during the Five-year Plan. I would like to know what steps the Government has taken to meet the demands of the Coast Guard. I do not have any objection in regard to other matters. Therefore, I support the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHAN F. FERNANDES): Shri V. Narayanasamy. The hon member is absent.

SHRIMATI URMILABEN CHIMANBHAI PATEL (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I would like to bring to the notice of the respected Minister, through you, that Gujarat has a 2,500 KM long coastline. Gujarat is also a border State To Pakistan. We all know about the activities of Pakistan in relation to our country. This is a very sensitive issue and the situation in Gujarat is also very sensitive. We all know that the RDX has been infiltrated into Gujarat from Pakistan on a large scale. It has become a very serious problem for us as to how to restrict it because on the border between Pakistan and Gujarat only two sides are open. On the one side

there is a long desert of Kutch and on the other side is the coastline. It is very difficult to seal the border of the desert area. It is also difficult to cross the desert area. But the coastline is totally open. It is not at all protected as it should be. No serious steps have been taken to protect it. As far as I know, very limited attention has been paid to it. I think it is a very serious problem for Gujarat in particular and for the country in general. Through this coastline infiltration of Pakistani nationals into Gujarat is going on on a large scale. Spies are also being pushed through this coastline. All types of antinational activities are being promoted by these people on our soil. So, I would urge upon the Minister, through this House, to take serious steps to check this infiltration. To check illegal infiltration from this coastline, adequate number of ships should be deployed to protect this coastline.

Sir, you will be astonished to know that on a large scale smuggling activities are going on through this coastline and on the whole border of Saurashtra and Kutch as both these places do not have any protection through naval agencies. These activities are flourishing so much that it has posed a serious problem to Gujarat. It is not possible for the Gujarat Government alone to tackle this problem. A serious note should be taken of this and adequate steps should be taken to check this activity. I do not know what exactly can be done in this matter because it is all defence-related and technical issues. I think this Coast Guard system should be modernised. It should be made more effective so that these activities are checked.

Sir, as you know, once upon a time Rajasthan was the centre of anti-national activities and anti-social activities. As soon as the Rajasthan border with Pakistan was sealed, it became impossible for the infiltrators to enter India. Now they have shifted to Gujarat. That is why a serious note should be taken. Moreover terrorist activities that were going on in Rajasthan and in Jammu and Kashmir have been checked by those State Governments by taking some serious steps and vigilant steps. Now these terrorists have shifted to Gujarat. We have some information that.....'this temple is the centre of these activities' or 'that hotel is a centre of these activities' or 'that city is a centre of these activities'. This is also a very serious thing. If the western States become the centres of terrorist activities, then Gujarat and Maharashtra would be very badly affected. And from this point of view also, we should take care of it. So, I urge upon the Minister and the Defence Ministry to take serious note of it. When the new Act comes, it should be taken care to see that special steps in regard to Gujarat are taken so that the coastal line of Gujarat can be guarded.

Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, for giving me time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES): Thank you, Mrs. Patel. Now, I would call Mr. S. Ramachandran Pillai.

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PILLAI (Kerala): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

I would like to draw the attention of this august House and of the Minister of three important aspects. I do agree with my hon. colleagues on the security challenges we face in our coastal belt. Of course, we should take all measures for safeguarding our coasts, for safeguarding our borders. Here, we are discussing an important piece of legislation. Let us go into the provisions of this legislation and on that basis let us come to conclusions. I also agree with the hon. Minister that this Bill was considered by the Standing Committee on Defence and they made a unanimous recommendation. But my submission is, Sir, I want to present before this august House three important issues not considered by the Committee. One is

this. The Minister stressed here the object of this Bill. The object of this Bill is to make the provisions of the Coast Guard Act to be in conformity with the provisions of the Army Act, 1950 and the Navy Act, 1957. It is so short. But the proposed amendments are not in consonance with this object. Three substantive amendments have been made in clauses 3, 4 and 5 and other procedural aspects. Let us go into clause 3. What does the Bill seek? The Bill seeks punishment for desertion. The proposed amendment seeks to provide that if anybody is found deserting, then he shall forfeit all pay, salvage, prize money allowances that have been earned by him and the pensions, gratuities and the medals that might have been granted to him and also all clothes, etc., etc. I want to put this question to the hon. Minister. What is the relevant provision in the Army Act with regard to this thing? Section 38 of the Army Act deals with this particular provision. There, there is no confiscation of the medals or clothes or any such thing. I am reading it, Sir. "*Desertion*: Any person subject to this Act who deserts or attempts to desert shall serve, on conviction by a court-marshal, a term which may extend to seven years or such less punishment as the Act mentions." There is no provision for confiscation of any of the medals, any of the awards or any other thing so provided. This Bill is not in consonance with the Army Act. Look at the Air Force Act. This proposed amendment is also not to keep the present Bill in consonance with the Air Force Act. Of course, there is a provision in the Naval Act with regard to this particular thing. In section 49 of the Naval Act, some similarities are there. But the proposed amendment is at variance with the provisions of section 38 of the Army Act and section 38 of the Indian Air Force Act. The other clause, that is, clause-4, is a very interesting clause. We are passing the amendment to this particular clause fifty years after our independence. This is a slur on the rule of law in our country. What does it say? This clause is dealing with the period of limitation for filing the cases. The present provision is three years. What does it say? "Within a period of three years and such period shall commence,—(a) on the date of the offence; or (b) where the commission of the offence was not known to the person aggrieved by the offence or to the authority competent to initiate action, on the first day on which such offence comes to the knowledge of such person or authority, whichever is earlier." There is no such law in India providing for this particular provision. Suppose I am not aware of any offence. After fifty years, how can I say that somebody who had committed some offence fifty years ago, can be hauled up by invoking the provisions of this Bill? That is why, as I stated earlier, this is a slur on the rule of law in our country.

The other provision seeking amendment is this. Where it is not known by whom the offence was committed, on the first day on which the identity of the offender is known to the person aggrieved by the offence or to the authority competent to initiate action, whichever is earlier. No such provision is existing in any law in our country. The similar provisions are the Army Act, section 122, the Air Force Act, section 121 and the Naval Act, section 79. There is no such provision, as proposed by the Minister. Still the Minister states that his intention is to put this provision in the Coast Guard (Amendment) Bill, 1996 in consonance with the provisions of the three ACTs. It is not so. Look at clause 5. This clause also relates to increasing the time limit. If a person is serving in the Army, in the Navy, in the Air Force, in the Border Security Force or in the Coast Guard, he ceases to be a subject under the provisions of this particular Bill after six months. Now, the Minister is requesting us to extend the period of limitation from six months to three years That is

the proposed amendment in clause 5. But look at the provision of the Army Act. The period prescribed in that Act is six months. Look at the provisions of the Air Force Act, look at the provisions of the Naval Act. So, my first submission is that the present amendment is not going to keep these amendments in consonance with the provisions of the three Acts. The Acts are before us. The aims and objects proposed in the Bill are just to confuse us and just to mislead the august House. That is my first criticism against the Statement of Objects and Reasons.

The second point is this. Many committees have gone into these questions. If you look into the entire history of military set-up in our country, there are four stages. I am not going into the historical background. After independence we passed the Army Act in 1950, the Air Force Act in 1950, the Navy Act in 1957 and the Coast Guard Act in 1978. An issue came up in 1965. After the Second World War United States of America, Canada and the United Kingdom thought of having a uniform law with regard to Army, Air Force and Navy. So, when they were discussing these issues, we in India also thought of discussing this particular issue and in India a Committee was appointed on 1st April, 1965. The members of the Committee, as per the Ministry of Defence Order No. 9/1/61/D/AG-1, dated 1st April, 1965, were—the Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Defence, Chairman, a representative of the Ministry of Law, the Director of Personnel Services, Army, the Director of Personnel Services, Navy, the Director of Personnel Services, Air Force, the Judge Advocate General, Army, the Judge Advocate General, Navy and the Judge Advocate General, Air Force. The terms of reference—it is absolutely necessary to mention it—were to study thoroughly the historical background of the disciplinary codes of the three Services; the difficulties encountered in operating them; codes of other democratic developed countries and their experience in operating them; possible changes in the social, economic and political set-up of the country; and to draft a uniform code in order to rationalise the present Service Acts, taking into consideration the development in criminology, penology and other aspects. I am not going into the other aspects. The Committee worked from 1965 to 1977 and it submitted a report to the Government. The Ministry of Law vetted that report and a uniform Armed Forces Code Bill was shaped by the Ministry of Law in 1978. This particular Bill was examined by the Directors of Personnel and the Judge Advocates General of Army, Navy and Air Force and they came to the conclusion that the three forces themselves were not unified and the working problems of each force were different. They also said, "there is no need for any uniform code because of the different working conditions in the Navy". They also said—it is important here—that the punishments... (*Time bell rings*)... I am concluding, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES): Your party is allotted four minutes. You have already taken 13 minutes. Please conclude.

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PILLAI: I do agree, Sir. But because of the particular circumstances kindly let me elaborate this point. We are considering an important piece of legislation.

They also said that the punishments laid down in the Army and the Air Force Acts were more severe than the Navy Act. It was considered desirable to amend the Army and the Air Force Acts in accordance with the recommendations of Sir Arthar Trever Harris, accepted earlier by the Cabinet, headed by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, the then Prime Minister of India, in the year 1964. They also said that the provisions relating to restrictions on fundamental rights were identical in the Army and the Air Force Acts, but the provisions in the Navy Act were at

variance. The same should be brought at par with the Navy Act. These were the recommendations. These were again considered by the Chiefs of Staff Committee in 1979 and they came to the conclusion, "the uniform code for the three Services need not be adopted".

The second recommendation is, the three Services Acts should be amended to make them progressive and fall in the line with the law of the land and with the Acts of similar other countries. This is the important recommendation which was made in 1979. After going into all these reports by the three Chiefs of Staff, it was considered by the Government at that point of time. In 1983 the Government prepared a Bill. That Bill is still pending before Government. The present situation is, since the three Services are entirely different no uniform code is necessary. Now the Minister is changing his position. Let him come forward and say, "What are the reasons and why our consistent position is being changed". Secondly, all the recommendations suggest to us, persuade us, to amend all these Acts in consonance with the present situation and also in consonance with other Acts in the neighbouring countries. Sir, I have drawn your attention to clause 4—how undemocratic it is and how that particular provision is against the rule of law in our country. Sir, this is not in consonance with the consistent stand so far taken by us. The Minister is coming forward with more stringent, more severe and more draconian proposals. These are three important aspects. The proposed amendments are not in consonance with the objects as stated in the Bill. This Bill is not in consonance with the other Acts. Our consistent position is, we treat it separately. Thirdly, this Bill should be in consonance with the changing situation.

Sir, I would only like to refer to one provision in the Army Act. There is Section 48 which is about intoxication. If an officer is found intoxicated, there is lesser punishment. If a common Armyman is found intoxicated, he is to be imprisoned for two years. This is the provision. The officers and the Armymen are treated differently. If you look at all the provisions of the Act, we can see such sort of treatment. It was passed in 1950. From 1965 to 1977 a Committee went into it. The Government also agreed that all these laws should be looked into and amended in tune with the change of period. The Minister has come forward with a Bill which is not in consonance with these things. Completely contrary to this, he is proposing draconian provisions. Therefore, I strongly object to the amendment. I would request the Minister to refer this matter to a Select Committee.

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): So far as this Bill is concerned, it has a limited scope. There is no controversy on it. There is Section 14(b) which provides protection to fishermen. This Section is helpful for the Tamil Nadu fishermen. Sir, it is a very sensitive matter. The hon. Minister belongs to our State. He is also a lawyer. He knows very well about the activities going on in our State. He also knows about the killings of fishermen by the Sri Lankan Navy.

I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether there is any demarcation done by our officials. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in an earlier discussion on the external affairs, you discussed this matter. You spoke about the killing of the Indian fishermen by the Sri Lankan Navy. Particular reference was made as to whether there was any demarcation which could serve as a warning to our fishermen. I want to know from the hon. Minister whether there are any officials who could tell the fishermen as to what extent they could go in order to prevent killing of the Tamil Nadu fishermen by the Sri Lankan Navy. Sub-clause (e) of clause 14 deals with assistance to customs authorities in dealing with anti-smuggling

operations. As far as anti-smuggling operations are concerned, yesterday there was a Press Meet in Chennai taken by the Defence officials. Today we have seen in newspapers that some LTTE people were arrested in Rameswaram. I would now refer to sub-clauses (b) to (f) of clause 14. As far as our State is concerned, we must give a warning to the Sri Lankan Navy because killing of our fishermen is going on. This is a very sensitive issue. I think the hon. Defence Minister, who is from our State, should take care of this sensitive issue. Everyday there are reports of killing of Indian fishermen by the Sri Lankan Navy. I want to know whether our Navy officials can take some action against the Sri Lankan Navy when incidents of this nature take place so as to protect our fishermen. The Bill makes a provision for dealing with such matters, including

measures for safety of life and property of fishermen at sea and collection of data, as may be prescribed. The hon. Minister knows the position of the Tamil Nadu coastal area. The State Government has got some special police service for this purpose. The Navy people are also there. But smuggling activities are going on in Tanjavoor, Pudukottai, Nagapattinam, etc. These are going on everyday. Today there is a news-item in the Indian Express which speaks about the Press Meet taken by the Defence officials in Chennai. According to this report, some items were seized by our Customs officials with the help of the Navy officials. This Bill is the only Bill which provides for protection to our fishermen, including assistance to them at sea while in distress. There is no other law which provides for this. I request the hon. Minister to take necessary steps with the help of this Bill, so as to prevent killing of our fishermen by the Sri Lankan Navy. In view of the welcome provisions, I support the Bill.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI) in

श्री सतीश प्रधान (महाराष्ट्र): महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से मंत्री जी के ध्यान में दो-तीन बातें लाना चाहता हूं। वैसे तो मैं इस बिल को सपोर्ट करता हूं फिर भी कुछ बातें मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहूंगा। महोदय, कोस्ट गार्ड्स को आज के युग में आपने जो कम्युनिकेशन सिस्टम उपलब्ध कराया है, वह आधुनिक नहीं है जिसकी वजह से वे एक-दूसरे के साथ ठीक ढंग से संपर्क नहीं कर सकते हैं, ऐसी मेरी इन्फॉरमेशन है। उस विषय में आप कुछ जानकारी दें तो अच्छा रहेगा। दूसरी बात, उनको जो वायरलैस सैट दिए हैं वह अत्याधुनिक तो नहीं है लेकिन साथ-साथ में लोकल पुलिस के साथ-साथ सम्पर्क करने की भी सुविधा उनके पास नहीं है। यदि आप ऐसा चाहते हैं कि वह ठीक ढंग से काम करे तो इस विषय में भी आपको ख्याल रखने की आवश्यकता है। नहीं तो, यह कोस्ट गार्ड का बिल या कुछ भी हम करेंगे उनसे हम ठीक ढंग से काम नहीं ले पाएंगे, यह चीज मैं आपके सामने लाना चाहता हूं। कोस्ट गार्ड को जो आपने हथियार दिए हैं तथा स्मगलर के पास जो हथियार है उसमें काफी फर्क है। हमारे कोस्ट गार्ड के हाथ में उतने अच्छे हथियार नहीं दे रखे हैं। इस विषय में आप क्या करने वाले हैं, इस विषय में क्या सुधार करने वाले हैं यह भी हम सदन में आपसे जानना चाहते हैं? मैं एक और बात बताना चाहूंगा कि जब बम्बई में बम विस्फोट हुआ था तब उस टाईम पर आर०डी०एक्स जो कोंकर्ण रीजन में लाया गया था उसके बाद में यह कोस्ट गार्ड को मदद करने के लिए, सपोर्ट करने के लिए प्राईवेट लोगों के पास से किराए पर कुछ बोट ली गई थी। उनको जो किराया देना था वह किराया देने के बारे में भी सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट और स्टेट गवर्नमेंट में पूरा ताल्लोकात नहीं हो पाया और उनको अभी तक किराया नहीं मिला है, वह शिकायत कर रहे हैं। इस विषय पर भी आप क्या करने वाले हैं, यह भी मैं जानना चाहूंगा? आखिरी बात यह है कि जहां कोस्ट गार्ड हैं और वहां जो लोग मछली मारने के लिए समुद्र में जाते हैं और जब उनके ऊपर कुछ आफत आती है तो उनको मदद करने के लिए भी यहां कोई नहीं होता है। तो उनको आप क्या इंस्ट्रक्शन देने वाले हैं, यह भी मैं जानना चाहूंगा। मेरा ख्याल है कि मैंने जो कुछ कहा है मंत्री जी ने सुना होगा, ऐसा मैं समझता हूं क्योंकि वह तो कुछ और बात करने में बिजी हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): नहीं-नहीं, मंत्री जी सुन रहे हैं Dr. Biplab Dasgupta, you are disturbing the

श्री सतीश प्रधान: वह तो बिजी है दूसरे ही प्रोग्राम में।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): आप आगे बढ़िए।

श्री सतीश प्रधान: नहीं, मेरा तो हो गया, इतना ही था और तो कुछ नहीं है। मैंने पांच मुद्दे रखे हैं, आप इनका जवाब दीजिए।

श्री अनन्तराय देवशंकर दवे (गुजरात): धन्यवाद उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय। जो यह बिल इस सदन में लाया गया है सबसे पहले तो पिल्लै जी ने जो बात बताई कि 1965 में एक समिति गठित की गई थी और 1970 में उसकी रिपोर्ट आई और रिपोर्ट के बाद उस समय के डिफेंस मिनिस्टर बाबू जगजीवन राम जी के समय 14 जुलाई, 1978 में यह बिल पहली बार बना और उस समय जो एम्स एंड ऑब्जेक्ट्स दिए गए थे उन एम्स एंड ऑब्जेक्ट्स में बताया गया था कि:

> "The need for setting up of a Coast Guard organisation for the purpose of ensuring the safety of navigation in our waters, protection of our off-shore installations and fishing interests, organising salvage and pollution control measures and enforcement of national laws in our maritime zones..."

महोदय, जो अब सरकार कुछ अमेंडमेंट्स ला रही है उसके बारे में पिल्लै जी ने बड़ी अच्छी बात बताई है। लेकिन जो उस समय देश के सामने एम्स एंड ऑब्जेक्ट्पस रखे गए थे कि ऑफ-शॉर इंस्टॉलेशन है, स्मगलिंग है, फिशरमैन की प्रोटेक्शन है उनके लिए आज तक हमारा जो कोस्ट गार्ड बना उसमें क्या-क्या तरक्की हुई, कितनी तरक्की हुई, क्या काम किया मैं मंत्री जी से और सरकार से यह जानना चाहता हूं क्योंकि सारा कोस्ट गार्ड बिल का जो फ्रेम वर्क है उसमें उनके तीन हैडक्वार्टर हैं—बम्बई, चिन्नई और अहमदाबाद। उसमें 11 डिस्ट्रिक्ट हैं। उसमें मुम्बई से लेकर चेन्नई तक जो पूरा वैस्टर्न कोस्ट है, उस कोस्ट पर जो यह कोस्ट गार्ड काम कर रहा है, उसमें 5 डिस्ट्रिक्ट वैस्टर्न कोस्ट पर हैं। उसमें एक गुजरात का पोरबंदर भी है। मैंने यहीं हाउस में कई बार यह सवाल और मसला उठाया था कि पोरबंदर की जगह आप दूसरी जगह जो कच्छ और कच्छ में जखऊ है, वहां पर कोस्ट गार्ड का हैड क्वार्टर रखें। उसके पीछे कई कारण हैं। क्योंकि बिल्कुल कच्छ का जो वैस्टर्न पार्ट आफ दी कच्छ है और जखऊ बॉर्डर पर है, वहां से स्मगलिंग हो रही है, वहां से आर्म्स आ रहे हैं, वहां से घुसपैठ हो रही है और यह कई समय से चला आ रहा है। कई बार इस सदन में मैंने यह बात उठाई है और सरकार को चेतावनी भी दी है। हमारे पहले होम मिनिस्टर चव्हाण जी वहां जाकर देखकर आए हैं। दूसरा जो भयंकर मसला है सिरक्रिट का है। अभी अगस्त 1996 में हमारे ओ॰एन॰जी॰सी॰ के चेयरमैन श्री वोहरा जी ने एक रिपोर्ट में बात कही है कि 111 तेल के ड्रिलिंग बाम्बे हाई और कच्छ में हुए और जखऊ से 36 किलोमीटर अंदर जहां पाकिस्तान का बार्डर है, वहां रिफाइनरी बन रही है। वहां तेल मिल गया है। हमारे इस एरिया में भी 111 कुंओं की ड्रिलिंग हो चुकी है। अभी यह बात सामने नहीं आयी है लेकिन रिपोर्ट में कहा गया है कि इतने कुएं कच्छ के एरिया में और गुजरात के एरिया में हैं। यह बात अभी तक नहीं खुली है। लेकिन पाकिस्तान की नजर जो सिरक्रिट का मसला है, उस पर है। और यदि हम कोस्ट गार्ड को अच्छी तरह से जखऊ में नहीं रखेंगे तो मुझे पूरा संदेह है क्योंकि आज जखऊ और वैस्टर्न पार्ट ऑफ कच्छ में पीने के पानी की बड़ी समस्या है। पीने का पानी वहां नहीं है। जवानों के लिए पीने का पानी बहुत दूर से लाया जाता है। इसलिए हम कई दिनों से, कई सालों से कह रहे हैं कि नर्मदा वाला मसला अगर हल हो जाए तो पीने के पानी की समस्या जो कच्छ, बनासकाठा, साबरकाठा और जामनगर में बहुत ज्यादा है, वह समस्या भी हल हो जाए। और कच्छ में नर्मदा जाने से वैस्टर्न कोस्ट पर उनको पानी पहुंचना आसान हो जाएगा और जो लोग आज वहां से खिसकते जा रहे हैं, जवानो को पीने के पानी के लिए 200 किलोमीटर तक जाना पड़ता है, ऐसी समस्या से घिरा हुआ सारा एरिया है, और अगर इस जगह कोस्ट गार्ड के लोग जाएंगे, वहां रहेंगे तो मुझे पूरा भरोसा है कि वहां के लोगों में भी एक विश्वास बैठेगा। फिर लोग अच्छी तरह से काम करेंगे तथा वहां से खिसकेंगे नहीं। कोस्ट गार्ड में उनके डायरेक्टर जनरल ने भी कई समस्याएं बताई हैं। मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय से यह भी जानना चाहूंगा कि तीन हजार दो सौ करोड़ रुपये उन्होंने मॉडर्नाइज़ेशन के लिए मांगे थे। ठीक है, वह पंचवर्षीय योजना में होने वाली बात है लेकिन आपने कितना खर्च किया? शिप बिल्डिंग के लिए कलकत्ता और गोवा जो आपने फिक्स किए थे, वहां भी काम नहीं हो रहा है तो मैं गवर्नमेंट से जानना चाहता हूं कि आप कब यह कदम

उठाएंगे कि कोस्ट गार्ड को स्ट्रेंथन करने के लिए जो सारी समस्या पहले से है, जो सारा वैस्टर्न कोस्ट है, उस एरिया में जहां पर कच्छ और सौराष्ट्र एरिया है, वहां से घुसपैठ की बड़ी समस्या खड़ी हो गयी है। तो मेरी सरकार से यह प्रार्थना है, विनती है कि आप उनका हैडक्वार्टर पोरबंदर से लेकर जखऊ से जाइए। उससे हमारी जो वहां की समस्या है उसको भी राहत मिलेगी और लोगों में एक विश्वास जगेगा कि सरकार कुछ न कुछ कर रही है। कई होम मिनिस्टर्स ने वहां जाकर मुलाकात की है और यह समस्या मैं जानता हूं कि बहुत पुरानी है। फिर भी जो आप अमैंडमैंट लाए है, उन अमैंडमैंट्स के संबंध में पिल्लै जी ने कहा कि इसे सिलैक्ट कमेटी को भेजना चाहिए, मैं इस राय से सहमत नहीं हूं।

मेरा सरकार से यह अनुरोध होगा कि आप अमेंडमेंट तो पास कीजिए लेकिन कोस्ट गार्ड्स के लिए, जो पूरा वेस्टर्न कोस्ट गार्ड्स पन्द्रह सौ पन्द्रह किलोमीटर को जो दरिया के किनारे रहते हैं, जो मछुआरे लोग वहां रहते हैं, उनको भर्ती कीजिए तभी यह समस्या हल होगी। ऐसा मेरा मानना है। वैसे आप जो अमेंडमेंट लाए हैं, मैं उसका विरोध नहीं कर रहा हूं, लेकिन आप कोस्ट गार्ड्स को मजबूत करने के लिए कुछ न कुछ कदम अवश्य उठायें। मैंने जितने प्रश्न किए हैं सरकार उनका जवाब दे। यही मेरी प्रार्थना है। धन्यवाद।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): धन्यवाद दवे जी। श्री वी० नारायणसामी।

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. I thank you for giving me this opportunity. Sir, the amendments that have been brought forward by the Minister of State for Defence under the Coast Guard (Amendment) Bill are very simple in nature. This Bill provides for harsher punishment for desertion. Apart from that, for earlier disposal of cases, provisions have been made in the Bill. Sir, before coming to the provisions of the Bill, I would highlight two or three important points which are very vital for guarding the coastline of this country by the Coast Guards and the Indian Navy. Sir, three important focal points are the Bombay sea area, the Andaman and Nicobar area where in a small State ships are moving and the third is the coastline of the Indian Ocean. From the reports available, we find that even narcotics are being moved through ships. From the report submitted by Vice-Admiral Ganesh, who is Director-General of the Coast Guards, we find how narcotics and RDX were being moved through the ships. He stated categorically in this report that after the bombay blast of 1993 when they intercepted and searched the ships, they were able to find how narcotics and RDX were being moved by ships. Apart from that, within a week they searched about one thousand vessels. Evidence was shown how the movement of RDX by ships on the coastline was going on. Sir, I want the hon. Minister to clarify the position as to whether our coast guards are fully equipped or not. Sir, though they are supplementing the job of the naval forces in this country, the coast guards are not fully equipped to man the coastline because we find on the Indian Ocean side fishing vessels from Thailand, Bangladesh, Pakistan and other countries come in the Indian Ocean on the Indian coastline beyond the international territorial for fishing. They do fishing in plenty. In the past, they came here, caught the fishes and gave to that area. Our coast guards could not do anything. Even our naval vessels could not do anything because they have a sphosticated system of catching the fishes. They have got a system of lighting. When the fishes see that light, they come in plenty. These people catch these fishes and go away. Our coast guards cannot do anything. Sir, the hon. Minister for Defence comes from the State of Tamil Nadu. His constituency is on the coastline. Shri T.R. Baalu also comes from that area. The coastline of Tamil Nadu is being used for smuggling goods by various people, including the LTTE and others, who use sophisticated boats which can go at a speed of 100—110 kms. per hour. Within minutes, they cross the Indian Ocean and go to the Sri Lankan side. Items like petrol, diesel, groceries and medicines are being

smuggled by them from the Indian territory, when there is an embargo imposed by the Sri Lankan Government, when there is fighting between the terrorist outfit and the Sri Lankan Government. Even today, on the coastline of Tamil Nadu, these activities are going on.

Another pathetic situation is, day in and day out, we have been raising it in this august House that the Indian fishermen are being killed indiscriminately by the Sri Lankan naval forces when our fishermen go for fishing within the Indian territorial waters. The Director-General of Coast Guard, Vice-Admiral Ganesh, had given an interview in which he had said that whenever they intercept such carft, when they find our territorial waters being violated by Sri Lankan fishermen, they show mercy to them and allow them to go. Sir, even last week, we raised this matter in this House in connection with an incident where two of our fishermen were killed by the Sri Lankan naval forces when our fishermen were fishing in the Indian territorial waters itself. The Coast Guard could not do anything.

I want to point out, in this connection, that the Coast Guard has got an outmoded system of communication. Apart from this, the vessels which the Coast Guard is having do not have a speed of more than 30—40 kms. per hour. When this is the case, how would they be able to intercept the enemy ships? How would they be able to function effectively when they are using such an outmoded system? The Coast Guard strength is: 506 officers, 2694 sailors and 470 civilians. This is not sufficient. The authorities are not fully satisfied with the system that they have. The Coast Guard has only 50 ships and 30 aircraft at their disposal.

Coming to the Andaman and Nicobar area, ships move in that area; ships from Visakhapatnam, from Cochin, from Madras, from Sri Lanka, etc. Every five minutes, a ship is moving in that area. Illegal weapons are being carried through these ships. Apart from illegal arms, a lot of narcotics are also being carried. I do not know how the Coast Guard ships would be in a position to intercept these vessels and try to find out whether they are carrying genuine cargo or they are involved in smuggling. Not to speak of Thailand, not to speak of Myanmar, which are encouraging the illegal arms and narcotics trade.

Therefore, I want to emphasise that the Coast Guard has to be fully equipped to meet this challenge. Sometime ago, when the Finance Bill came up for discussion in the House, we had raised the question of resentment in the defence services—the Army, the Navy and the Air Foce—that the Budget allocation made by the Finance Minister was inadequate. They went on record to point this out. When we raised this issue, the hon. Finance Minister gave an assurance on the floor of the House. Thereafter, partly, some amount has been given to them by the Finance Minister at the time of mid-term appraisal.

Still, I believe, our three services have to be fully equipped. What do we see when we compare ourselves with Pakistan? Pakistan is spending more than one-third of its Budget on augmenting their weapon systems. On the other hand, in our case, it is not more than one-tenth of the Budget. We are not in a position to acquire new weapon systems. At the same time, we made a lot of fanfare when we acquired the SU-30 aircraft. It was as if we have achieved everything by this acquisition. It is not like that. Our Army, Navy and Air Force need to be fully equipped. Our neighbour, Pakistan, which is a small power, has already got a lot of sophisticated weaponry, with the backing of the United States of America. They get help from China also. They have a tie-up with China. China is helping them in a big way.

Therefore, now it is time for the hon.

Minister to have a review of the existing defence equipment in the Defence departments and fully equip those departments. Especially, I may point it out to the hon. Minister that the Cost Guard is ill-equipped; it can't be said that it is equipped even moderately.

Today our young men are not prepared to join the armed forces because of the frustration there. Promotions are not there, their welfare is not being taken care of. That's why our young men are not joining the armed forces. Now, to add to all this, the hon. Minister wants deterrent punishment for desertion. He wants that the inquiry be completed, etc., etc.,--everything is there in the Bill. Today if these people want to leave their service and go out why should you punish them? You fix a minimum period of service for them. They work there for that period and thereafter they go away. Therefore, I want the hon. Minister not to make the punishment deterrent, because this will only lead to people not joining the armed forces. That is what is going to happen. Therefore, though the intentions are good, they are not viable, they are not possible practically.

Sir, what happens in the Central Government? In the Central Government, if an employee executes a bond, serves the Government for some time and thereafter if he goes away, violating the bond which he had executed, what action is the Government taking? It is only for the sake of record that they have this bond. therefore, deterrent punishment is not going to serve any purpose. On the contrary, you should give more facilities to the sailors, to the pilots and officers who are working in the Coast Guard.

Apart from all this, you should modernise your defence systems, especially the Cost Guard. You should have sophisticated vessels, better aircraft--aircraft which can be operated by trained personnel in a simple way. The Coast Guard has been helping people during cyclones, etc.,--they are helping people in civilian operations also. We salute them. Moreover, there is tension mounting on the international borders, especially India being surrounded by enemies, both know and unknow. Now, our naval systems, especially the Coast Guard, have to be better-equipped so that they will be able to meet the growing demands on them. But, by bringing these amendments the hon. Minister is not going to achieve anything. Therefore, kindly look into the suggestions made by the hon. members for modernising the Coast Guard, for having more sophisticated vessels, aircraft and trained people and try to help people.

Sir, especially onb one point the hon. Minister is one with me, that is, about the Indian fishermen who have been killed by the Sri Lankan naval force. But he is helpless because LTTE on one side and the Sri Lankan naval forces on the other, are killing our fishermen there. Our Indian Government could not do anything about it. For everything we have to approach the Prime Minister. And the Prime Minister says that he will take it up at the diplomatic level with the Prime Minister, or even the President, of Sri Lanka. then there is no action thereafter.

Now, it is fine that you have divided the zones and created sub-zones for the Coast Guard. But the operations have to be streamlined: Sophistication has to be brought about, modernisation has to take place and more and more trained personnel have to be involved therein by which you can achieve these purposes--and not by b ringing in these amendments.

With these words, Sir, though I support the amendments partially--not fully but only partially--I would like to tell the hon. Minister to follow whatever suggestions I have given. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Thank you, Mr. Narayanasamy.

Hon. Members are aware that today is the last day of Shri Naayansamy's present tenure in the Rajya Sabha. We wish him all the best. We hope, after a short rest and relaxtion—I won't say hibernation or incubation!—he will be back in this House. I wish him all the best. We will miss him.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Thank you, Sir.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT): Sir, I don't want to make it very formal. We will certainly be missing Mr. Narayanasamy, there is no doubt about it. A few of his expressions were rather wild, but they were very lovable.

We will really miss you. I am very sorry to say "bye-bye" to you. I am really very sorry. I wish you all the best, all the best.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his good gesture.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Dr. Biplab Dasgupta. Just be brief.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Bengal): It is odd to have such a discussion in the middle of another discussion.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): It is Mr. Narayanasamy, you know.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: He used to interrupt many people in many different ways on anything. So, he would not mind it. Nor will, I think, the Minister mind it.

We have crossed swords many times with Mr. Narayanasamy in this House. Obviously, we have a lot of differences between us on political issues. But he is a very lovable person. Certainly, we are all very sad that Mr. Narayanasamy is leaving the House. Politically, I don't wish him to come back.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): I wished him to come back after a short rest or relaxation or may be incubation or hibernation.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: As I mentioned earlier also, politically, I want to see him defeated in the election. But, personally, I very much like him to come back.

SHRI V. P. DURAISAMY (Tamil Nadu): Sir, only one minute.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): I think you have to participate in the debate.

SHRI V.P. DURAISAMY: I am just seeking a clarification....*(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Not about Mr. Narayanasamy. We have wished him all the best.

SHRI V.P. DURAISAMY: I have already wished him. We are relieving him partly, not fully. ...*(Interruptions)* Sir, on behalf of my party, D.M.K., I support this Amendment Bill. Tamil Nadu has more than 1,200 km. of coastal area.

The hon. Members from Tamil Nadu, Mr. Sundaram, and Mr. Narayanasamy have sought many clarifications. They have suggested that the Indian Navy should be sophisticated and modernised to protect Indian fishermen in our coastal areas.

There is recurring shooting everyday. We are seeing everyday through newspapers rising number of cases like the cricket score. We read "Five persons were shot dead today" or "there persons were taken away by the Srilankan Navy today". News items are appearing like that.

Just 45 days ago, Tamil fishermen were taken away by the Srilankan Navy. They were kept under its custody for more than 30 days. My leader and our Chief

Minister repeatedly requested the Prime Minister. The Government of India has responded to it properly and in time. Batches by batches all fishermen have been released. We do not want to see such a thing should recur in future. So, I request the Government of India and the Prime Minister to protect Tamil fishermen. they should be allowed to fish in that particular area daily. We are seeing that the Srilankan Navy is encroaching and treapassing our area and disturbing our fishermen.

Other Members have mentioned about the LTTE activities in the coastal area of Ramanathapuram. It has appeared in newspapers yesterday that the LTTE people were sending some letters to some people in Tamil Nadu, that they were exchanging their circumstances and that they were getting help from some Tamil Nadu people. This should be curtailed. The Tamil Nadu Government and our leader is very serious about curtailing the activities of the LTTE, about taking all effective steps to protect the interests of Tamil fishermen, for which the Government of India should help us.

Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Thank you, Mr. Duraisamy.

Mr. Agarwal, do you want to say something?

FELICITATIONS TO RETIRING MEMBER, SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY—Contd.

श्री रामदास अग्रवाल (राजस्थान): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं नारायणसामी जी का ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं। मुझे यह कहते हुए बड़ी प्रसन्नता हो रही है कि मैंने श्रीमान नारायणसामी जी के साथ दो विदेश यात्राओं में अपना समय गुजारा था। भूतपूर्व राष्ट्रपति महोदय के साथ जब हम यात्रा में गए तो इनकी उपस्थिति .....(**व्यवधान**).... इनकी उपस्थिति के बगैर हमारी यात्रा अधूरी रहती। मैं इस बात को भी जानता हूं कि जब वह इस बैंच पर बैठते थे तो कभी बायीं तरफ देखते थे तो वामपंथियों पर अपनी तलवारें निकाल लेते थे और जब दायीं तरफ देखते थे तो काल्ड दक्षिण पंथियों की ओर भी इनकी निगाहें कुछ कमजोर नहीं हुआ करती थीं। लेकिन उसके बावजूद भी मैंने यह पाया है कि विदेश में यात्रा के समय नारायणसामी जी बिल्कुल बदले हुए व्यक्ति रहते थे और पार्टी इत्यादि की बातें न करके, बहुत शानदार और वजनदार बातें किया करते थे। आज जब वह यहां से विदा हो रहे हैं तो निश्चित रूप से हमारे मन में उनके प्रति बहुत सहानुभूति भी है, बहुत स्नेह भी है और बहुत आशा भी है कि नारायणसामी जी जैसे दबंग वक्ता फिर से एक बार राज्य सभा में आएं, ऐसी आशा हमारी होना स्वाभाविक है। बाकी तो उनकी पार्टी जाने। हम क्या कर सकते हैं। .....(**व्यवधान**).... पांडिचेरी में हम हैं नहीं, होते तो आपकी मदद करते। थैंक यू वैरी मच, वाइस चैयरमैन साहब कि आपने मुझे इजाजत दी।

श्रीमती उर्मिला चिमनभाई पटेल (गुजरात): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री नारायणसामी जी हमारे साथीदार रहे हैं और जो लाइवली स्पीचिज़ उनके थ्रू यहां हमें सुनने को मिलती थीं उसकी हाउस को कमी रहेगी और जो उन्होंने योगदान दिया है उसकी भी कमी रहेगी। हम चाहते हैं कि जल्दी से जल्दी वह हाउस में वापस आएं और हमारे कांग्रेस के तो यह साथीदार हैं ही, लेकिन पूरे हाउस की मंशा है और मैं मानती हूं कि यह जरूर पूरी होगी। मैं उनको शुभकामनाएं देती हूं।

श्री सतीश प्रधान (महाराष्ट्र): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, नारायणसामी जी से मेरा 1992 में जब मैं इस सदन में आया था पहला संबंध हुआ था और जब सदन में बहुत जोर था तथा काफी हंगामा चल रहा था, तब का वह समय था। लेकिन तब से मैं देख रहा हूं कि श्री नारायणसामी जी की आवाज़ सदन में घूम रही है, जिस दिन नहीं घूमी हो ऐसा दिन मुझे याद नहीं। उनका बोलने का तरीका बहुत अलग था, लेकिन जब आपके सामने उधर चेयर पर बैठते थे तो हाउस को चलाने का तरीका भी बहुत अलग रहता था और दोस्ती करने के लायक उनका खुद का जो खास ढंग है वह तो मैं कभी भी भूल नहीं सकता हूं। ऐसा प्यारा आदमी कल से सदन में नहीं होगा, लेकिन मुझे पूरा विश्वास है कि जल्द से जल्द हम उनको फिर से पास पायेंगे और सदन की दोस्ती और बढ़ेगी, इतना मुझे विश्वास है। धन्यवाद।

श्री जलालुदीन अंसारी (बिहार): महोदय, नारायणसामी जी की कमी हम लोगों को खटकेगी इसमें